

REMARKS

Claims 30-61 are pending in this application. Claims 30 and 61 are independent claims. Claims 30-36, 39-44, 46-49, 51, 53-58 and 61 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 30, 34-35, 39-43 and 45-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Document No. XP002328030, titled “Coding of Still Pictures” by French National Body/Jean Brada (hereinafter “Barda”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Barda discloses a system for providing a high level of protection and access control of a JPEG 2000 encoded image. The system includes extracting a subset of the original data and replacing the removed subset with lures. The system also combines the modified image with watermarking at the delivery side. The system allows for securing that the original content will not be available at any point, unless it carries a hidden information identifying, for instance the user. See at least Section 2 of Brada.

Applicants note that Barda does not teach or suggest each of the elements recited in claims 30, 34-35, 39-43 and 45-61. Independent claims 30 and 61, in part, recite “a process for secured distribution of video sequences according to a digital stream format.” (underlining added) Barda does not teach or suggest these features.

Barda is directed to protection and access control of a JPEG 2000 encoded image. As is known to one skilled in the art, a JPEG image is not the same as a video image. Barda does not teach or suggest protecting and controlling access to a video image.

Furthermore, claims 30 and 61, in part, recite “analyzing the digital stream ... to generate complementary information ... comprising a digital information for coding the original stream and suitable for permitting reconstruction of modified frames.” Barda also does not teach or suggest these features.

Barda discloses that the decoding phase is combined with a watermarking process to insert, in an invisible way, an identification label, for example the identity of the end user or the session which is logged at the secure server level. See section 4 of Barda. The watermark of Barda, which the Office Action equates with the complimentary information recited in the pending claims, does not include “digital information for coding the original stream,” as recited in the pending claims. The watermarking of Barda, also is not suitable for “permitting reconstruction of modified frames,” as recited in the pending claims.

Each of claims 30 and 61 also recites “transmitting the modified main stream and the complementary information separately from a server to an addressed equipment.” Barda does not teach or suggest these features. The Office Action noted that the introduction to Barda discloses protection based on data transmission using two channels and a secured server. Transmitting the data using two channels is not equivalent to transmitting the “transmitting the modified main stream and the complementary information separately from a server to an addressed equipment,” as recited in the pending claims. In fact Barda discloses transmitting the watermark, which the Office Action equates with the complementary information, with the JPEG image. Therefore, Barda does not teach or suggest each of the elements recited in claims 30 and 61. Each of claims 34-35, 39-43 and 45 depend on claim 30 and therefore incorporate all of the elements of claim 30, in addition to the further feature recited in each of claims 34-35, 39-43 and 45. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 30, 34-35, 39-43 and 45-61 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 31-33, 36-38 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barda in view of a document titled “Efficient 3D Wavelet Transform

Decomposition for Video Compression” to Moyano et al. (hereinafter “Moyano”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Moyano discloses a three-dimensional Wavelet Transform algorithm for video compression. Moyano does not cure the deficiencies of Barda. In particular, Moyano does not teach or suggest “a process for secured distribution of video sequences according to a digital stream format,” “analyzing the digital stream ... to generate complementary information ... comprising a digital information for coding the original stream and suitable for permitting reconstruction of modified frames” and “transmitting the modified main stream and the complementary information separately from a server to an addressed equipment,” as recited in claim 30, upon which claims 31-33, 36-38 and 44 depend. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 31-33, 36-38 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-61 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory, obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of copending App. No. 11/167,783, which has at least one Applicant in common with the present application. Enclosed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer in order to overcome the provisionally rejection of claims 1-61 on the ground of nonstatutory, obviousness-type double patenting. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the provisional rejection of claims 1-61 be withdrawn.

Disclaimer

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 27592-01127-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 26, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Enclosure: Terminal Disclaimer

Electronic signature: /Arlene P. Neal/
Arlene P. Neal
Registration No.: 43,828
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant